

Organization \_\_\_\_\_ Bldg./Room \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days

Official Business

Penalty For Private Use, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER




02 1M \$00.65<sup>0</sup>  
0004244945 AUG09 2012  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314

UNDELIVERABLE RETURN  
REGISTERED MAIL  
RETURN TO SENDER  
21/EZ/80 756 RTXIN

RECEIVED  
AUG 31 2012  
USPTO MAIL CENTER

9470481210 0023





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

STEVE CHEN  
NETOSPREY, INC.  
2140 SHATTUCK AVENUE  
BERKELEY CA 94704

MAILED

AUG 09 2012

In re Application of  
Chen, et al.

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

Application No. 09/734,499

DECISION

Filed/Deposited: 11 December, 2000

Attorney Docket No. M-9546 US

This is a decision on the petition filed on 30 July, 2012, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) for revival of an application abandoned due to unintentional delay.

**NOTE:**

The application went abandoned in August, 2004 and the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment in February 2005.

Nonetheless, Petitioner made no showing of diligent inquiry and disclosure as to the nature of events that triggered abandonment and allowed that condition to continue for such an extended period of time.

The address on the petition is other than that of record.

If Petitioner desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate Notice must be submitted.

A courtesy copy of this decision will be mailed to Petitioner.

However, all future correspondence will be directed to the address of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

DECISION

RECEIVED  
OPAP/IAP

SEP 06 2012 1

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b)."

This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. §704.

As to the Allegations  
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee.

**Petitioner does not appear to have addressed properly the requirements under the rule.**

**Any deficiencies must be overcome.**

BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

The Applicant failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 19 May, 2004, with reply due absent a timely extension of time on or before 19 August, 2004.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 19 August, 2004.

The Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 22 February, 2005.

On 30 July, 2012, Petitioner filed, *inter alia*, a petition (with fee) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), with no revocation/power of attorney and/or Notice of Change of Address, with averment of a reply in the form of a continuation application but no copy of an electronic acknowledgment receipt or the like evidencing such, and made the statement of unintentional delay. However, as noted above, Petitioner made no showing as to the nature of the events that triggered the abandonment and allowed it to continue for such an extended period of time. And it would be prudent for Petitioner to include a copy of an electronic acknowledgment receipt or the like evidencing the submission of a proper reply to the 19 May, 2004, non-final Office action as required under the Rule.

Thus, Petitioner failed to satisfy the requirements pursuant to the rule and outlined above and below.

This deficiency **must** be addressed.

*Petitioners' attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) as to the showing regarding a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137.*

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office **must** inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.<sup>1</sup>

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994). And the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application.<sup>2,3</sup>

Moreover, the Office has set forth in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I) the showing and timeliness requirements for a proper showing for relief under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 in these matters.

Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy

---

<sup>1</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §11.18, formerly §10.18, to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

<sup>2</sup> See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>3</sup> The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition. (Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.) Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable. Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a). And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter. Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care. (By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.))

agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.<sup>4</sup>

As to Allegations of  
Unintentional Delay

As indicated above, the requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a proper reply, a proper statement and/or showing of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee.

As discussed above, it does not appear that Petitioner has satisfied the requirements under the rule.

**Petitioners' attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(II) as to a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137.**

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By Mail:                      Mail Stop PETITION  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    P. O. Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


By hand:                      U. S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                                    Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

---

<sup>4</sup> In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912)(quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300  
Attn: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214—it is noted, however, that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2<sup>5</sup>) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./  
John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

CC  
ROBERTO CAPRIOTTI  
K&L GATES LLP  
210 SIXTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15222

---

<sup>5</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

**§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.